

Kathryn G. Spelman, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 154512)  
Daniel H. Fingerman, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 229683)  
Mount, Spelman & Fingerman, P.C.  
RiverPark Tower, Suite 1650  
333 West San Carlos Street  
San Jose CA 95110-2740  
Phone: (408) 279-7000  
Fax: (408) 998-1473  
Email: kspelman@mount.com, dfingerman@mount.com

Counsel for Plaintiff San Francisco Technology Inc.

DURIE TANGRI LLP  
DARALYN J. DURIE (Bar No. 169825)  
RYAN M. KENT (Bar No. 154913)  
217 Leidesdorff Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Phone: (415) 362-6666  
Fax: (415) 236-6300  
E-mail: ddurie@durietangri.com  
rkent@durietangri.com

SCHEEF & STONE, LLP  
JOHN G. FISCHER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
ERIC C. WOOD (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
500 N. Akard, Suite 2700  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Phone: (214) 706-4200  
Fax: (214) 706-4242  
E-mail: [john.fischer@solidcounsel.com](mailto:john.fischer@solidcounsel.com)  
E-mail: [eric.wood@solidcounsel.com](mailto:eric.wood@solidcounsel.com)

Attorneys for Defendant  
PAVESTONE COMPANY, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAVESTONE COMPANY, LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:10-CV-01651-RS

**STIPULATION REGARDING  
MOTION BRIEFING AND HEARING  
SCHEDULE AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER**

JURY DEMANDED

Plaintiff San Francisco Technology Inc. (“SF Tech”) and Defendant Pavestone Company LLC (“Pavestone”) (collectively the “Parties”) jointly submit this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order for motion briefing and a hearing schedule. The Statement filed by Pavestone previously on February 10, 2011 (Docket No. 26) is withdrawn. The Parties stipulate as follows:

1. On February 3, 2011, the Court held a case management conference (CMC) in this case, jointly with other cases in which defendants were severed from *San Francisco Technology Inc. v. Adobe Systems Inc.*, Case No. 5:09-cv-06083-RS (the former defendants in this case are hereinafter referred to as the “Defendants”).

2. The Defendants have indicated that they intend to file motions to dismiss. At the CMC, the Court directed the Defendants to meet and confer with SF Tech on a schedule for briefing and hearing the motions to dismiss. The Defendants and SF Tech exchanged emails and held a telephone conference call on the morning of February 7, 2011. During that conference call, the Defendants and SF Tech agreed to the following schedule:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Event</u>
February 10, 2011	SF Tech will file its amended complaint against defendant Procter & Gamble in Case No. 5:10-cv-01652-RS
March 14, 2011	Deadline for Defendants to file motions to dismiss
May 5, 2011	Deadline for SF Tech to file oppositions to motions to dismiss
May 12, 2011	Deadline for Defendants to file replies
May 26, 2011, 1:30 p.m.	Hearing on motions to dismiss

3. The Parties jointly request that the Court adopt this schedule for the Defendants’ motions to dismiss.

4. Based on the Court’s statements during the CMC, it is Defendants’ position that the Court has stayed all discovery in this case, including initial disclosures, while the motions to dismiss are pending. SF Tech’s counsel does not recall the Court making that order during the CMC and suggested deferring the issue of a discovery stay until later.

1  
2 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

3 Dated: February 10, 2011.

Mount, Spelman & Fingerman, P.C.,

4  
5 /s/ Daniel H. Fingerman  
6 Counsel for Plaintiff  
7 San Francisco Technology, Inc.


8 Dated: February 10, 2011.

Scheef & Stone, L.L.P.

9  
10 /s/ Eric C. Wood  
11 Eric C. Wood  
12 Attorney for Defendant  
Pavestone Company, LLC

13 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14  
15 Date: 2/10/11

16   
17 The Honorable Richard Seeborg  
18 U.S. District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28